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To the Editors

Dear Editors,

Thank you very much for giving us an opportunity to revise our manuscript entitled “Factors associated with intention to adhere to recommendations for follow-up after an abnormal colorectal cancer screening result in Japan” (MS: 4397612371072042), which was previously submitted to BMC Public Health. Also, we could like to thank our two reviewers - Dr. Mark Dignan and Dr. Annette E Maxwell for their insightful comments and helpful suggestions.

We have revised the manuscript taking into account reviewers’ comments. All revisions and changes have been underlined. Also, we have detailed the revisions on a point-by-point basis as listed below.

The new title is “Factors associated with intentions to adhere to colorectal cancer screening follow-up exams”. All five authors have approved the revised version of the manuscript.

Thank you for your editorial assistance with this manuscript, we look forward to hear from you at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Ying-Fang Zheng (Corresponding Author)
Department of Social Gerontology
Graduate School of Medicine
The University of Tokyo
Tel: 03-5841-3514
Fax: 03-5684-6083
e-mail: teiyf-tky@umin.ac.jp
Responses to comments by Dr. Mark Dignan

Major Compulsory Revision

(1) Literature cited varies in age, but many citations are quite old. Specifically, an updated source for #11 is needed along with revised information.

As suggested, we have updated the information about inappropriate follow-up of CRC screening in the United States. We included reference to research by Nadel and colleagues in which a national sample of primary care physicians and a national random sample of adults were surveyed with a high response rate, thus we believe that this data adequate reflects the situation regarding inappropriate follow-up in the United States. Please refer to p.5, 3rd paragraph.

We have deleted the literatures that contained outdated information. Four former references have been omitted (former number 9, 15, 22, 66), and four new references have been added, number 13, 15, 38, 45.

(2) At the end of the “Procedure” section, additional information is needed describing the reasoning behind the decision not to provide information on costs, etc. to patients. Was the information ever provided?

This helpful suggestion has been incorporated into the revised manuscript. Because we were concerned that information we provided would influence respondents’ perceptions, when designing this study, we had paid carefully attention to information providing to our study participants. We used the standard letter recommending follow-up and an information brochure about CRC screening, both of these are currently used in Japanese community-based cancer screening program, as routine procedure for distributing information. These information materials showed and explained the procedures, however did not include information regarding the benefits, costs, potential uncertainties and limitations of each test, therefore we also decided not to offer those information.

Please refer to p. 10, 3rd paragraph.
(3) The sections on perceived susceptibility, severity, and benefits are overly brief. Additional information is needed.
More explanations have been added. Please refer to p.14.

(4) Under the section labeled “Intention to adhere to follow-up recommendation (Table 2), additional discussion is needed providing information interpreting the results shown in the table.
We have added some material to the Results section as suggested. Please refer to p. 23.

Minor Essential Revisions
(1) Extra article ‘a’ in the sentence ‘Myers at al suggested that a physician,,,’
We have corrected this error. Please refer to page 6.
Responses to comments by Dr. Annette E Maxwell

Minor Essential Revisions
(1) The title could be misleading, as I was expecting a survey among subjects who had actually received a recommendation for follow-up after CRC screening. However, the survey is conducted among subjects who obtained CRC screening. At the time of the survey, nobody had actually received a recommendation for follow-up diagnostics. I would suggest changing the title (and accordingly the text) to “Factors associated with intentions to adhere to colorectal cancer screening follow-up exams”.
We have changed the title according the suggestion. We have also modified the text, table and Figure accordingly.

Discretionary Revisions
(1) I would recommend shortening the paper a bit for easier readability. For example, in the section predictor variable, it is not necessary to discuss the items that have not been included in the analysis.
We have attempted to shorten the Methods section by curtailing the description items, such as subjective health status, the existence of chronic conditions, bowel disease history and personality. Please refer to p.16, 2nd paragraph, and p. 17, 2nd paragraph.

(2) It is also not necessary to describe the details of how items have been changed after the pretest. The finalized items that are included in the analysis are most relevant. If the items are listed in the table, the authors could refer to that table without listing the items in the text.
We have changed the text as suggested, and in stead of explaining the process of the pretest in detail; we added more information about the items used in analysis. Please refer to p. 14.